DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 325 CE 052 704

AUTHOR	Arellano, Sally
TITLE	Analysis of State Funding Alternatives for Vocational Education.
INSTITUTION	Northern Arizona Univ., Flagstaff. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Arizona Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, Phoenix.
PUB DATE	Mar 84
NOTE	47p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Data Analysis; *Educational Equity (Finance); *Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Federal Aid; Financial Policy; Postsecondary Education; Program Improvement; Revenue Sharing; School Funds; School Support; Secondary Education; *State Aid; State Federal Aid; State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Arizona

ABSTRACT

Vocational education funding strategies currently in use by each state were analyzed to provide insights into the strategies used by other states that might be useful in modifying Arizona's methods for funding vocational education. An extensive review of national studies concerning vocational education funding was conducted, and each of the states was surveyed to determine vocational education funding methods. The study revealed that no states were comparable to Arizona on many of the identified criteria. Several states were comparable to Arizona on four or five factors. However, each of these states was significantly different from Arizona on one or more other significant factors that would prohibit comparison. The study did not reveal any specific states that have developed methods for coordinating federal vocational funding with state basic support funding. Several states reported having both supplemental state appropriations as well as provisions in their basic state aid formulas for added vocational funding. There were no readily available solutions to vocational education funding that would meet the needs of Arizona. Communications with other state departments of education revealed that Arizona was not alone in its search for a more equitable funding approach for vocational education. (Appendices include a chart of state vocational education governance structures and delivery systems and information on the distribution of federal and state funds.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308325

ANALYSIS OF STATE FUNDING ALTERNATIVES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Parsons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ARIZONA CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Administered by NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

CE052704

ANALYSIS OF STATE FUNDING ALTERNATIVES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Sally Arellano

The Arizona Center for Vocational Education
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011

March, 1984

Second Printing

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title: Project 1995

Educational Act Under Which the Funds Were Administered: Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482

Source of Contract: Arizona Department of Education
Phoenix, Arizona

Contractor: The Arizona Center for Vocational Education
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011

Disclaimer: This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Research Coordinating Unit, Arizona Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Arizona Department of Education position or policy.

Discrimination Prohibited: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the Arizona Center for Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Arizona Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

FOREWORD

Project 1995

Project 1995 was funded in March, 1983, to provide direction for Vocational Education in Arizona through the year 1995. The study had seven objectives which resulted in the following seven monographs:

- A Study of Arizona Labor Market Demand Data for Vocational Education Planning
- A Study of Vocational Education Follow-Up Procedures
- Analysis of Data on the Nature and Scope of Vocational Education Programs in Arizona
- Articulation of Vocational Education Programs in Arizona
- Analysis of State Funding Alternatives for Vocational Education
- A Model for Determining Vocational Education Funding Priorities
- A Plan to Improve Arizona Vocational Education Data Systems

Although each monograph covers a specific area of study, there are relationships among them and all provide recommendations for improvements in Arizona's vocational education data systems.

A number of recommendations for short-term and long-range modifications in the data system have been made. As these changes are implemented, more valid and reliable data will be available to plan vocational education in the future.

Acknowledgements

We thank Task Force 1995 for their support and guidance throughout the duration of this project. We acknowledge the efforts of the Technical Review Committee members for their time in providing direction and in reviewing the monograph. The memberships of the Project 1995 Task Force and the Technical Review Committee are presented in Appendix A.

Barbara M. Gutheil
Assistant Director - Research
Arizona Center for Vocational Education

Robert V. Kerwood
Director
Arizona Center for Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this monograph is to provide a taxonomy of alternative funding strategies currently in use by each state. This taxonomy was intended to provide insights to alternative strategies used by other states that might be used in modifying Arizona's methods for funding vocational education.

The study conducted an extensive review of national studies concerning vocational education funding. Each of the states was surveyed to determine vocational education funding methods.

The study revealed that no states were comparable to Arizona on many of the identified criteria. Several states were identified that were comparable to Arizona on four or five factors. However, each of these states were significantly different from Arizona on one or more other significant factors that would prohibit comparison. The study is a helpful resource for comparing individual states to Arizona with relationship to specific characteristics.

The study did not reveal any specific states which have developed methods for coordinating federal vocational funding with state basic support funding. Several states reported having both supplemental state appropriations as well as provisions in their basic state aid formulas for added vocational funding.

There were no readily available solutions to vocational education funding that would meet the needs of Arizona. Communications with other state departments of education revealed that Arizona was not alone in its search for a more equitable funding approach for vocational education. Further, the results of the investigation and discussions with recognized authorities on funding disclosed that there really was no approach currently in use in any other state that should be recommended for Arizona.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FUNDING	ii
FOREWORD	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Data Sources	1
Criteria	1
Survey of States	2
2. THE TAXONOMY	3
3. ANALYSIS	4
Governance Structures and Delivery Systems	5
Federal Funding	5
Formula Distribution	6
Discretionary Distribution	7
State Funding	8
Appropriations	8
Basic State Aid Formulas	8
4. CONCLUSIONS	10
REFERENCES	11
APPENDICES	
A. TASK FORCE 1995 MEMBERS	12
B. SUMMARY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDING ALTERNATIVES	13
C. STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS	14
D. DISTRIBUTION METHODS FOR FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS	23
E. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS - FY 1983	27
F. DISTRIBUTION OF BASIC STATE AID FORMULA FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - FY 1983	33
G. DISTRIBUTION OF STATE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION -FY 1983	36

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this monograph is to provide a taxonomy of alternative funding strategies currently in use by each state as a component of Project 1995. In developing the taxonomy, it was hoped that allocation of vocational education funds in states comparable to Arizona could be determined. At the same time, the taxonomy was intended to provide input as to alternative strategies in use by other states that might be suitable for consideration in modifying Arizona's funding methods. A final purpose, related to the preceding one, was to provide some indication as to how states prioritize state and federal funding of vocational education and how those funding sources are coordinated.

Data Sources

In order to develop the taxonomy, several vocational education studies, reports and expert resource personnel were consulted and a list of criteria was determined. The studies reviewed are presented in the attached References.

Criteria

After reviewing the available information, the following list of criteria was developed.

- Vocational Education Governance Structure
- Vocational Education Delivery System
- Federal Vocational Education Fund Distribution
  - Formula Method
  - Criteria used for Formula
  - Discretionary Method
  - Amount of Federal Funds
- State Vocational Education Distribution
  - Basic State Aid Method
  - Supplemental Appropriations
  - Amount of State Funding
- Secondary and Post-Secondary Distribution

These criteria were used to determine areas of comparability among the states.

Survey of States

It was determined that the available sources were not adequate to provide information from each state for each of the criteria. Therefore, a survey of funding alternatives was developed and sent to 49 states. Responses were received from thirty-one of the 49 states.[1] A copy of the survey form is attached (Appendix B).

[1]Information from nine additional states was received after the analysis was completed; however, that information was included in the tables.

Chapter 2

THE TAXONOMY

The taxonomy of alternative funding strategies currently in use by the states is provided in Appendices C through G.

Appendix C provides the governance structures and delivery systems for vocational education within each state. Information contained in this table may have become outdated since the 1978 Office of Education study. For the purposes of this report, however, it is adequate in providing a general overview of governance structures and delivery systems among the states.

Percentages are included to provide a general indication of the focus on levels of vocational education offerings in the states.

Appendix D illustrates the methods of federal vocational education fund distribution through formula and discretionary means. This information, and that contained in Appendices E through G, was obtained through reports and a survey of states. Any missing data is a result of no survey response or inadequate responses on those received.

Appendix E provides the dollar amounts and distribution of 1983 federal vocational education funds. The "Other" category usually consisted of research, state planning, in-service, and other functions which could not be identified by education level.

Adult Education was sometimes included in the "Other" category and sometimes within the Formula or Discretionary within either secondary or post-secondary categories. This may affect comparability among states.

Large amounts in the "Other" category were often for state supported institutions or listed as project or grant funding. These were not clear as to the difference between discretionary funding or "Other" and may also affect comparability.

Appendices F and G provide state vocational education funding information. Appendix F presents funding through the basic state aid formula and Appendix G presents funding through supplemental appropriations. This data was collected through a survey of each state and it was often difficult to differentiate between the two methods of state funding.

Chapter 3

ANALYSIS

In attempting to determine the comparability of vocational education funding in other states to vocational education in Arizona, the ten criteria as applied to Arizona were used as a benchmark. The cutoff points within the criteria, however, were sometimes arbitrary or limited. They were arbitrary in the sense that a cutoff point was determined as one that was considered reasonable. For example, the amount of federal funds received by each state was ranked and the ten states above and below Arizona were considered to be within a comparable range. The criteria were limited in the sense that information was incomplete or not available for certain criteria. Survey responses were not received for 18 states, limiting such information as the federal formula/discretionary distribution spread, secondary/post-secondary state funding and methods of distributing state funds. Another limitation in comparability was the incomplete or unclear information that was provided in the surveys concerning state funding. It was not discernible from the surveys how state level funding was split between appropriations and formula funding. It is assumed that state totals may be inaccurate regarding state formula funding and, as in Arizona, difficult to determine.

With these caveats in mind, it was found that no states were comparable to Arizona on all criteria. To get a general idea, however, the following number of criteria comparable to Arizona are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

NUMBER OF CRITERIA IN WHICH STATES ARE COMPARABLE TO ARIZONA

Number of Criteria	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	AZ		AR	NJ NE	SC CT	NM UT TX CA SD NV	KS MN MO WA IN DE KY OR LA AL	TN WV ND MT NY VT CO IL OH	MN MA RI AK VA NC MI	PA

The criteria within each grouping may vary considerably and missing information may change the grouping, but considering the available information, there appeared to be little comparability among states.

Governance Structures and Delivery Systems

To determine comparable governance structures among states, those states having a State Board of Education/Vocational Education and a separate State Board for Post-Secondary Education providing vocational education were considered. There were 21 states similar to Arizona.[2] These states were Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Delivery systems were compared as to the:

(1) Number of facilities offering five or more vocational education programs,

(2) Percentage of secondary to post-secondary facilities,

(3) Prominence of Area Vocational Centers (AVC's).

There were 16 states comparable to Arizona except that 14 of those had more extensive use of AVC's than does Arizona. These states included Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Montana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Washington, and Wyoming. The states of Nebraska and Wyoming are the two comparable states with no more AVC's than Arizona.

Six states had both governance structure and delivery systems comparable to Arizona. There also appeared to be no consistency among the governance structure, delivery systems and funding systems.

Federal Funding

Federal funds for vocational education are made available to the states through the Vocational Education Act. Allocations to the states are based on relative numbers of population in various age groups, weighted for differences in state per capita income relative to a

[2]Gentry's study of governance structures indicated 31 states having this system. The 21 states here also represent supporting State Department structures.

national average. Arizona ranks 28th among the 50 states in federal funds received.

Priorities for expenditure of funds made available to the states under the Vocational Education Act have been determined by Congress. These priorities, however, have been generally expressed and the mechanisms used to support them was left up to the states.

The four basic priorities are:

(1) Location in an economically depressed area (EDA),

(2) Proposals for programs that are new to the area and designed to meet new and emerging occupational needs (NP),

(3) Relative financial ability of the LEA (RFA),

(4) Concentration of low-income families or individuals (LIF).

Additional priorities of ability to provide for programs for handicapped, low-income and limited English speaking students were expressed by Congress.

Congress did not, however, indicate what measures were to be used for each of the priorities or a preferred method of distribution. In 1977 an Office of Vocational and Adult Education Regulation required a formula to be used for distribution of funds under certain sections of the Act but did not specify how much of the total federal funds were to be so distributed.

Formula Distribution

The NIE Vocational Education Study (1981) goes into great detail concerning the inherent problems states have had in implementing the priorities and the formula. The authors concluded that, due to the various measures used to determine RFA, LIF, etc., there is nothing inherently fairer in formula distribution over other types of discretionary distribution of funds.[3] The states vary as to their use of both.

The authors of the NIE study determined there were typically three types of formulas in use by the states, although no two formulas were alike. These were: (1) tabular; (2) percentage reimbursement; and (3) weighted pupil methods.

---

[3]For further discussion relating to problems of measurement and federal requirements, see Hoachlander, Distributing Federal Categorical Aid by Formula, October, 1981.

The tabular method usually consists of a printed table listing reimbursement rates based on points received for each priority factor. The percentage reimbursement method is similar except that a percentage of the LEA's expenditures to be reimbursed are determined based on the priorities. The weighted pupil method is also based on points earned for priority factors and then weighted by pupil cost factors.

Arizona and 26 other states use the weighted pupil method of formula distribution. Formula distribution of funds represents approximately 52% of all federal funds received by Arizona. Twenty other states for which surveys were analyzed also distribute 50% or more of their federal funds by formula.

Most of the state formulas use some kind of measure for the four priorities or criteria. These are not required to be part of the formula, however, and they may be addressed in discretionary distribution. The states are also free to use additional criteria in their formulas.

Arizona uses the four basic priorities as do 20 other states. Thirteen of those states use additional criteria such as tax effort, drop-out rates, youth unemployment, high-cost students or programs, and rural factors. Six of the 20 use the weighted pupil formula.

Discretionary Distribution

In addition to formula distribution, states retain a portion of their federal allocation to be distributed at the discretion of the State Board for Vocational Education. The method for distributing these funds was not always clear from the survey responses but it appears that project funding through an RFP or grant process is common. Another method was straight expenditure reimbursements for particular programs. States appear to use this area for their own priority setting within the federal parameters. For example, states may focus on the post-secondary level, provide for work-study or other special programs or focus on the handicapped.

Arizona uses the Request for Proposal (RFP) process and distributes approximately 27% of its total federal allocation in this manner. Eighteen of the states for which information was available also distributed 30% or less of their total allocations through discretionary means.

The distribution of federal vocational educational funds by both formula and discretionary means was focused on the secondary level in the majority of states.

State Funding

State-level funding for vocational education may take two forms; either the state makes separate supplemental appropriations, or funds through their basic state aid formula, or both. Based on the survey data received, it was often difficult to discern the difference between categorical, supplemental or various formula methods. However, the surveys did provide general indications of state funding.

The surveys provided total state input from both supplemental appropriations and basic state aid formulas. These amounts may be misleading because their relationship to one another was unclear. Because of the difficulty of determining how much of the block grant state aid formula goes to vocational education in Arizona, it might be fair to assume that other states have similar problems.

Appropriations

The separate state appropriations are not necessarily intended to meet state matching requirements of the federal act because local and state aid funds usually exceed the matching requirement.

The state appropriations are usually used to supplement projects initiated by federal fund expenditure but can also be an area which indicates strictly state priorities. For example, these funds have focused on the post-secondary level, been used for equipment, and facilities, or, as in Arizona, for new programs of state interest. Nine out of the 31 states responding to the survey* indicated 50% or more of their state appropriations went for post-secondary priorities.

Methods of distribution vary among the states but include grants, RFP processes, cost reimbursements and allocation through the state's federal fund formula.

Arizona ranked 18th out of 23 states, for whom information was available, in state supplemental appropriations. This comparison may be misleading due to variations in size of state, federal funds received, and state funding through the basic aid formulas.

Basic State Aid Formulas

The primary priority in most state aid formulas is to provide equity in either expenditures or revenues for schools. The formulas may or may not attempt to account for cost variations among programs. The various methods used among the states to account for cost variations in vocational education programs have been:

*Prior to the analysis

(1) Weighted pupils,
(2) Reimbursement based on instruction and pupil units,
(3) Excess cost reimbursements,
(4) Categorical aid.

Arizona uses the weighted pupil count in its block grant state aid formula. Nine other states for which information was available also use a weighted pupil system. Those states include Arkansas, Indiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Florida, Utah, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Detailed information on how the vocational education weighted pupil system works in other states was unavailable but would be valuable for further analysis.

Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed that no states were comparable to Arizona on many of the identified criteria. Several states were identified that were comparable to Arizona on four or five factors. However, each of these states were significantly different from Arizona on one or more other significant factors that would prohibit comparison. The study is a helpful resource for comparing individual states to Arizona with relationship to specific characteristics.

The study did not reveal any specific states which have developed methods for coordinating federal vocational funding with state basic support funding. Several states reported having both supplemental state appropriations as well as provisions in their basic state aid formulas for added vocational education funding.

There were no readily available solutions to vocational education funding that would meet the needs of Arizona. Communications with other state departments of education revealed that Arizona was not alone in its search for a more equitable funding approach for vocational education. Further, the results of the investigation and discussions with recognized authorities on funding disclosed that there really was no approach currently in use in any other state that should be recommended for Arizona.

REFERENCES

Arthur Young and Company. Vocational Education Cost Study of Arizona School Districts and Community College Districts, 1981.

Benson, C. S., E. G. Hoachlander, and R. Polster. Analysis of Distribution Procedures Used by States to Distribute Federal Funds for Vocational Education: Project on National Vocational Education Resources. Berkeley: University of California, 1981.

Education Commission of the States. School Finance at a Sixth Glance. 1982.

Hoachlander, E. Gareth. Distributing Federal Categorical Aid by Formula: The Case of Vocational Education. October, 1981.

National Institute of Education. The Vocational Education Study. 1981.

U. S. Office of Education. National Study of Vocational Education Systems and Facilities, Volume II: State Vocational Education System Descriptions. 1978.

Appendix A

TASK FORCE 1995 MEMBERS

Mr. Harold Arp

Mr. Eddie Basha

Mr. Eugene L. Dorr

Mr. George Evans

Mr. Robert E. Gocke

Mr. Harry Hollack

Dr. Eugene Hughes

Mr. John F. Kearney

Mr. Alex N. Nader

Mr. Bill Orr

Mr. G. M. Sollenberger

Mr. Peter Steen

Mr. Don Strauch

Mr. Jack Whiteman

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. John F. Kearney

Dr. Odus Elliott

Dr. Myrna Harrison

Mr. Stewart Miller

Mr. Dunbar S. Norton

Mr. Terry Trost

VOCATIONAL FUNDING SURVEY

ARIZONA CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

August 19, 1983

Please send us a copy of your formula for the distribution of federal vocational education funds for the 1983-1984 fiscal year. (If this information is available in your State Plan and you are providing a copy of it, please indicate.) State Plan enclosed ___, or funding formula attached ___.

Please provide a breakdown of the 1983-1984 federal funds (VEA) as follows:

	Vocational Education Grand Total	Basic Grants	Program Improvement & Supportive Services	Disadvantaged	Consumer & Homemaking	State Planning Evaluation
Formula distribution						
Secondary	$_____	$_____	$_____	$_____	$_____	$_____
Postsecondary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Discretionary distribution						
Secondary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Postsecondary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
State Administration	_____					
Other (Specify)	_____					
Total Federal Allocation	$_____					

Does your state provide any supplemental state appropriations for vocational education which are not part of the basic state aid formula appropriations? If so, what is the 1983-1984 appropriation?

Secondary . . . . . $_____
Postsecondary . . . . . $_____
Total . . . . . $_____

If your state provides a supplemental appropriation, how is it distributed to LEA's?

Does your state identify specific funding for vocational education within its basic state aid formula? If so, is it identified through categorical grants, a weighted formula or by some other method?

Secondary _____

Postsecondary _____

(Please send a description of your state's basic state aid formula if it is available.)

What is the budgeted amount to be distributed for vocational education for the 1983-1984 fiscal year through the basic state aid formula?

Secondary . . . . . $_____
Postsecondary . . . . . $_____
Total . . . . . $_____

ase return this form to Dr. Barbara M. Gutheil, Assistant Director-Research, Arizona Center for Vocational Education, NAU 6025, Flagstaff, AZ 86011.

Appendix C

STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION GOVERNANCE
STRUCTURES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
ALABAMA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division Voc. Ed. -Division Post-Sec. and Cont. Education -Division Instruction (Industrial arts, vocational guidance and counseling	15 Comp. High Schools 82 Area Voc. Centers (Sec. and Adult) 20 Tech. Colleges and Institutes 5 Junior Colleges 20 Community Colleges	10% 58% 14% 4% 14%
ALASKA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division Career and Voc Ed State Board of Regents of H.E. -Community College System	2 Comp. High Schools 2 Career Centers (Sec.) 10 Community Colleges	14% 14% 71%
ARIZONA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division of V.E. State Board Director Community College -Community College System	21 Comp. High Schools (9) Community College District 14 Community Colleges	55% 37%
ARKANSAS	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division Voc Ed (all Sec. and Post-Sec.) State Community Junior College board (C.C.'s have few occupational programs)	34 Comp. H.S. (Sec. only) 9 Area H.S. Centers (Sec. only) 23 State Post-Sec. Area Voc. Schools (Sec. only) 6 Commmunity Colleges (joint enrollment programs with AVS)	47% 13% 32% 8%

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
CALIFORNIA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	623 Comp. High Schools	78%
	Department of Education	9 R.O.C.'s* (Sec.)	1%
	-Voc Ed Unit	104 Community Colleges	13%
	Board of Governors	(70) District	
	California Community College System	64 R.O.P.'s*	8%
COLORADO	State Board of Comm. Colleges and Occup. Ed./Voc Ed	76 Comp. High Schools	79%
		7 Local AVC's (BOCES) (cooperatives)	7%
	-All Levels	7 State Community Colleges	7%
	State Board of Ed.	4 Local Jr. Colleges	4%
	State Board Community Colleges	2 (4-year) Colleges designated AVS	2%
CONNECTICUT	State Board of Ed.Voc Ed	35 Comp. High Schools	42%
	Department of Education	17 State-operated regional Voc-Tech.	
	-Division Voc Ed (Sec. and state AVTS)	schools	20%
	Board of Tech. Colleges	15 Locally adm. Voc. Ag. Centers	18%
	Board Trustees for Regional Comm. College System	4 State Tech. Colleges (H.S. and adult)	5%
		12 Community Colleges	14%
DELAWARE	State Board of Ed. and Sec. Ed./Voc Ed	25 Comp. High Schools	76%
		4 AVC's (Sec.)	12%
	Department of Education	4 Campuses/Del. Tech.	
	-Division Voc Ed	and C.C. System	12%
	State Board Trustees Delaware Tech. and Community Colleges		
FLORIDA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	94 Comp. High Schools	61%
	Department of Education	32 AVTC's (Post-Sec.)	21%
	-Division Public Schools (Sec. Voc Ed)	28 Community Colleges (14 have area	
	-Division Community College (Post-Sec.)	schools)	18%

*Regional Occupational Centers, Reg. Occupational Programs (shared time multi-institutional with R.O.P. areas).

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
GEORGIA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Office of Voc Ed (Sec. and Post-Sec.) State Board Regents H.E. (Junior Colleges with joint agreement with Office of Voc Ed)	9 Area Voc. Centers (Sec.) 23 Local Adm. Post-Sec. ATS (Post-Sec.) 2 State Adm. Post-Sec. ATS 3 Jr. Colleges with programs	24% 62% 5% 8%
HAWAII	Board of Regents/Bd. of Voc Ed Adm. Director Voc Ed	30 Comp. High Schools 7 Community Colleges	81% 19%
IDAHO	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed -Division of Voc Ed -State Dept. of Ed. State Board is also Board Regents of Univ. System	50 Comp. H.S. (Sec. only) 6 Post-Sec. AVTS (Post-Sec. only) (1 adm. by State Board 5 adm. by other colleges or universities)	89% 11%
ILLINOIS	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Dept. Adult, Voc. and Tech. Ed. (all levels for Voc Ed) Illinois Community College Board	600 Comp. High Schools 30 AVC's (Sec.) 51 Community College Campuses	90% 4% 7%
INDIANA	State Board Voc and Tech Education (separate from State Board) -Dept. Public Inst. -Comm. for H.E. (contracts with SBVTE)	86 Comp. High Schools 38 Coop. Area Programs (23 in central fac.) 13 Campuses Indiana Voc-Tech. Colleges	63% 28% 9%
IOWA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed (Sec. and Post-Sec.) Department of Education -Area School and Career branch of State Department	8 Comp. High Schools (15) 35 attendance centers merged area schools (Post-Sec.)	35% 65%

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
KANSAS	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	24 Comp. High Schools	42%
	Department of Education	14 AVT's (Post-Sec.)	25%
	-Div. of Ed. Services Sec. and Post-Sec.	19 Junior Colleges	33%
KENTUCKY	State Board of Occup. Ed.	4 Comp. H.S./area schools	
	-Bureau of Voc Ed	68 AVEC's (Sec.)	73%
	Board Trustees of V of K	14 VTS (Post-Sec.)	14%
	-Community Colleges	12 Community Colleges	12%
	State Board of Education	1 Tech. Institute	1%
LOUISIANA	State Board of Ed. and Sec. Ed./Voc Ed	24 Comp. High Schools	29%
	-Dept. of Education Sec. and Post-Sec.)	15 Career Centers (Sec.)	18%
		43 Voc-Tech. Post-Sec. schools	52%
	-Community Colleges	1 Community College	1%
MAINE	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	11 Voc Regions (area centers)	28%
	-State Dept. of Ed. and cultural services	22 Comp. H.S. and centers	56%
	-Bureau of Voc Ed (all levels)	6 Voc-Tech. Institutes (Post-Sec.)	15%
MARYLAND	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	46 Comp. High Schools	52%
	Department of Education	5 Voc High Schools	6%
	-Division Voc-Tech. Ed.	21 AVC's (Sec.)	24%
	State Board Comm. Colleges	17 Community Colleges	19%
MASSACHUSETTS	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	42 Comp. H.S. (4 reg.)	39%
	Department of Ed.	21 Voc High Schools	20%
	-Division Occ. Ed. (all levels)	26 Reg. Voc-Tech. H.S.	24%
		3 County Agric. Sch.	3%
		15 Community Colleges	14%
MICHIGAN	State Board Ed./Voc Ed (all levels)	269 Comp. High Schools	78%
		42 AVC's (Sec.)	12%
	State Department of Ed.	29 Community Colleges (34 campuses)	10%
	-Voc-Tech. Ed. Service		
	-Bureau H. Ed.		
	-St. Bd. Community and Junior College (advisory)		

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
MINNESOTA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Div. Voc-Tech. Ed. (all levels) State Board of Community Colleges (minimal)	28 Comp. High Schools 60 Co-op Centers (Sec.) 33 AVII's 17 Community Colleges	20% 43% 24% 12%
MISSISSIPPI	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Div. Voc-Tech. Ed.	40 Comp. High Schools 62 Voc. Centers (Sec.) 28 Post-Sec. Voc. Centers	31% 48% 22%
MISSOURI	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division Career and Adult Education (all levels) Coordinating Bd. for H.E. (Voc Ed reports to Div.)	200 Comp. High Schools 53 AVC's (Sec.) 16 Junior College Campuses	74% 20% 6%
MONTANA	State Board of Public Ed./ Voc Ed -Office of Pub. Inst. -Dept. of Voc and and Occ. Services -Board of Regents	15 Comp. High Schools 5 Voc-Tech. Centers (Post-Sec.) 3 Community Colleges (Post-Sec.)	65% 22% 13%
NEBRASKA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Division Voc Ed Technical Comm. College System (all sep. adm.) U of Nebraska - 1 school	57 Comp. High Schools 14 Tech. Comm. Colleges 1 (2-year) Post-Sec. Institute	79% 19% 1%
NEVADA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Department of Ed. -Voc and Adult Ed. Unit Board Regent - U.N. -Community Colleges	22 Comp. High Schools 3 Community Colleges (Post-Sec.) 1 AVT School (Sec. and Post-Sec.)	85% 12% 4%

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance		Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
NEW HAMPSHIRE	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	7	Comp. High Schools	21%
	-Division Voc Ed	20	AVC's (Sec.)	59%
	-Division Post-Sec. Ed.	6	Voc-Tech. College Post-Sec.)	18%
		1	Tech. Institute	3%
NEW JERSEY	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	79	Comp. High Schools	59%
	State Dept. of Ed.	19	AVC's (Sec.)	14%
	-Division of Voc Ed	20	AVT's (Sec.)	14%
	Office of Comm. Colleges	16	Community Colleges	12%
NEW MEXICO	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	25	Comp. High Schools	76%
	Department of Education	2	AVS (Post-Sec.)	6%
	-Div. Voc-Tech. Ed.	1	Junior College	3%
	(all levels)	1	Community College	3%
		4	Voc Ed. Institutes	12%
NEW YORK	Board of Regents/Voc Ed	375	Comp. High Schools	71%
	State Dept. of Ed.	44	BOCES (Sec.)	14%
	-Div. of Occup. and Continuing Education		(72 centers)	
		31	Voc High Schools	6%
	(all levels)	44	Campuses/Comm. Coll.	8%
	Office of H.E.	6	St. Ag. and Tech. Colleges	1%
	-Acct. Review			
	-Grant Adm.			
NORTH CAROLINA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	245	Comp. High Schools	80%
	St. Dept. Public Inst.	6	Area Centers (Sec.)	2%
	-Div. Voc Ed	35	Technical Institutes	11%
	-Dept. Community Colleges (all levels)	22	Community Colleges	7%
NORTH DAKOTA	State Board for Voc Ed	13	Comp. High Schools	48%
	(separate but has same members)	9	Voc Centers (Sec.)	33%
		5	Junior Colleges	19%
	Dept. Public Inst. (not under State Board of Education)			
	Board of Higher Education			
	-Univ. N.D.			
	-N.D. State			
	Two Independent Jr. Coll.			

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
OHIO	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	200 Comp. High Schools	73%
	Dept. of Education	49 Jt. Voc Districts	
	-Division Voc Ed	(Sec.)	18%
	Board of Regents	5 Community Colleges	2%
	Two-Year Post-Sec.	17 Tech. Colleges	6%
	Inst.	3 Gen. and Tech. Coll.	1%
OKLAHOMA	St. Bd. Voc and Tech. Ed.	39 Comp. High Schools	45%
	Department of Education	31 AVT's (Sec. and	
	(H.S. and AVC's)	Post-Sec.)	36%
	St. Regents for Hg. Ed.	14 Community Colleges	16%
	(Post-Sec.)	3 Tech. Inst.	3%
OREGON	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	119 Comp. High Schools	83%
	Dept. Public Inst.	23 Comm. Coll. campuses	16%
	-Career and Voc Ed	1 Tech. Inst.	1%
	Section		
	-Division of Comm. Coll.		
	State System of Hg. Ed.		
PENNSYLVANIA	State Bd. of Ed./Voc Ed	180 Comp. High Schools	61%
	(all levels)	18 Voc High Schools	6%
	-Bureau of Voc Ed	79 AVTS (Sec.)	27%
	(Sec.)	17 Comm. Coll. campuses	6%
	-Bureau of Comm.		
	Colleges		
RHODE ISLAND	St. Board of Regents for	8 AVC's	73%
	Ed/Voc Ed	1 Voc Ed School	9%
	-Bureau Voc Ed (Sec.)	2 Comm. Coll. campuses	18%
	-Bureau Post-Sec. Ed.		
SOUTH CAROLINA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed	68 Comp. High Schools	48%
	Department of Education	55 AVC's (Sec.)	39%
	-Office Voc Ed	18 Tech. Coll. campuses	13%
	State Board for Tech.		
	and Comp. Ed.		
SOUTH DAKOTA	State Board Vocational and	19 Comp. High Schools	63%
	Technical Education	6 AVC's (Sec.)	20%
	(1 of 3 ind. bds. within	5 Voc-Tech. schools	17%
	Dept. Ed. and Cultural		
	Affairs) (all levels)		

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
TENNESSEE	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Division Voc Ed Board of Regents	130 Comp. High Schools 50 Voc Centers (Sec.) 30 AVTS (Post-Sec.) 4 Technical Inst. 10 Community Colleges	58% 22% 13% 2% 4%
TEXAS	State Bd. of Ed./Voc Ed Texas Ed. Agency (all levels) Texas Tech. Institute	250 Comp. High Schools 152 AVS (Sec.) 56 Comm. Coll. campuses 4 St. Tech. Institute Campuses	54% 33% 12% 1%
UTAH	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Div. Voc and Adult Ed. Board of Regents (subordinate to St. Bd.)	88 Comp. High Schools 3 2-Year Colleges 6 AVC's (Sec.) 2 Tech. Colleges	89% 3% 5% 2%
VERMONT	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Div. Voc Ed Vermont Tech. College Trustees State College	15 AVC's (Sec.) 1 Tech. College	94% 6%
VIRGINIA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed State Dept. of Education -Div. of Voc Ed Board of Trustees of Virginia C.C. System	165 Comp. H.S./AVS 38 AVC's (Sec.) 33 Comm. Coll. campuses	70% 16% 14%
WASHINGTON	Commission for Voc Ed (individual agency) St. Board of Ed. (Sec.) St. Board of C.C.'s Post-Sec.	43 Comp. High Schools 5 AVTS (Post-Sec.) 27 Comm. College campuses	57% 9% 36%

Appendix C (Continued)

	Governance	Delivery System	% Voc Ed Offerings
WEST VIRGINIA	State Board of Ed./Voc Ed Department of Education -Bureau Voc, Tech. and Adult Board of Regents -Community Colleges (individual) -Community Colleges (state college) -University branches	40 Comp. High Schools 40 AVC's (Sec.) 3 Community Colleges	48% 48% 4%
WISCONSIN	State Board of Voc, Tech. and Adult Ed. (Post-Sec.) (delegates federal money to Dept. of Public Inst.) Dept. of Public Inst. -Bureau for Career and Manpower Dev. (Sec.) No State Board	187 Comp. High Schools 2 Regional Centers 34 Campuses of Voc, Tech.	84%
WYOMING	State Board of Ed./Occ Ed Department of Education -Office Occup. Ed. St. Comm. Coll. Comm.	20 Comp. High Schools 7 Community Colleges	74% 26%

SOURCE: National Study of Vocational Education Systems and Facilities. Volume II - State Vocational Education System Descriptions, U.S. Office of Education. 300-76-0315, September, 1978.

Appendix D

DISTRIBUTION METHODS FOR FEDERAL
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS

	Formula Method	Formula Criteria[1]	Disc. Method	Criteria[2]	Percent[3] Form	Disc.
ALAB.	Reimb. Rate	(RLEN) TE, UN	Not Specified (NS)	Subpart 2	70	2
ALAS.	--	--	--	--	--	--
ARK.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) DOR	NS	Subp. 2&3	67	9
ARIZ.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN)	RFP Process	All	52	27
CAL.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN)	NS	All	80	13
COL.	Reimb. Rate	(RLE) HCP	--	--	--	--
CONN.	Weighted Pts.	(RL) UN	NS	All	37	39
DEL.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) UN, DOR	NS	All (Post-Sec.)	51	34
FLOR.	--	(RLE)	--	--	--	--
GEOR.	Weighted Pts.	(L)	--	--	--	--
IDAHO	Reimb. Rate	(RLEN) HCS, UN	NS	Subp. 2,3,4	75	19
ILL.	Reimb. Rate/WP	(RL)	Project Fund.	All	62	22
IND.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) HCS, DOR, UN	Grants	Subp. 2	16	80
IOWA	Tabular	(RLE)	NS	Subp. 2,3,5	56	30
KAN.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN)	--	--	--	--
KENT.	Weighted Pts.	(RL) UN, HCP	NC	Subp. 2,3 (Post-Sec.)	81	19
LOUI.	Reimb. Rate	(RLEN) UN	NS	Subp. 2,3	75	13
MAINE	Weighted Pts.	(RL)	--	--	--	--
MARY.	Weighted Pts.	(RL) UN, DOR	None	--	91	0
MASS.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE)	--	--	--	--

Appendix D (Continued)

	Formula Method	Formula Criteria[1]	Disc. Method	Criteria[2]	Percent[3] Form	Disc.
MICH.	Tabular	(RLE)	--	--	--	--
MINN.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) HCP	--	--	--	--
MISS.	Reimb. Rate	(LE) TE, HCP	--	--	--	--
MISSO.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) UN	Formula Fact. Conver. to %	All & New Programs	43	53
MONT.	Tabular	(RLEN) DOR	Contracts	All	44	44
NEB.	Reimb. Rate	(RLEN)	NS	Subp. 2,3,5 (Post-Sec.)	79	11
NEV.	Weighted Pts.	(LE) HCP, UN	RFP Process	Subp. 2,3 (Post-Sec.)	69	20
N.H.	Weighted Pts.	(RL)	--	--	--	--
N.J.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) UN, DOR	NS	Subp. 3 (Post-Sec.)	55	14
N.M.	Weighted Pts.	(RL) UN	NS	All (Post-Sec.)	50	39
N.Y.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN)	NS	Subp. 2,3	74	14
N.C.	--	--	--	--	--	--
N.D.	Tabular	(RLEN)	None	—	80	0
OHIO	Tabular	(RLN) UN	NS	All (subp. 3 only Post-Sec.)	75	15
OKLA.	Tabular	(RLEN) HC, DOR, UN	RFP Process Contracts	Subp. 2, 3 (Sec.) Subp. 2, 35 (Post-Sec.)	37	27
ORE.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) UN	RFP Process	Jt. Programs 3, 4, 5	45	13

Appendix D (Continued)

	Formula Method	Formula Criteria[1]	Disc. Method	Criteria[2]	Percent[3] Form	Disc.
PENN.	Tabular	(RLE) UN	--	--	--	--
R.I.	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) UN, HC	--	--	--	--
S.C.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) DOR, TE	NS	Subp. 3,5 (Post-Sec.) Subp. 2 (Sec.)	77	4
S.D.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) TE, MIL	Reimburse Expenditures	Subp. 3,4 (Post-Sec.)	75	13
TENN.	Tabular	(RLEN)	None	--	46	0
TEX.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) UN, DOR, HCS	NS	Subp. 3 (RCU)	84	8
UTAH	Weighted Pts.	(RLE) HC	RFP Process	All	--	--
VER.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN) HC, R	RFP Process	Subp. 2	--	--
VIR.	Tabular	(RL) HCP	--	--	--	--
WASH.	Weighted Pts.	(RLEN)	--	--	--	--
W.VIR.	Weighted Pts.	(RL)	--	--	--	--
WISC.	Tabular	(RLEN) FS, U, P, ET, UN	Application	Same as form (Post-Sec.)	--	--
WYO.	Tabular	(RLE) HCP	--	--	--	--

SOURCES: Analysis of Distributions Procedures Used by States to Distribute Federal Funds for Voc. Ed., Benson, Hoachlander & Polster, Project on National Vocational Education Resources, U of C-Berkeley, 1980. 1984 State Plans were used to update and verify data for 22 states.

[1]Formula Criteria

R - Relative Financial Ability
L - Low Income Families (or Individual)
E - Economically Depressed Areas
N - New Programs
UN - Unemployment (General or Youth)
DOR - Drop Out Rates
TE - Tax Effort
HC - High Cost (HCS - students/HCP - programs)
MIL - Mileage for Multi-district programs
R - Rural
FS - Facility Status
U - Facility Utilization
P - Placement
ET - Enrollment Trends

[2]State plans and questionnaires generally did not specify criteria for distributing discretionary funds. Therefore, criteria is presented as the focus of distribution within Subparts of the Act. By implication, the formula distribution covers all subparts, however, some states restrict such distribution to specific subparts or to specific subparts for either secondary or post-secondary.

[3]Caution that percentages are rough indications of money distributed through formula or discretionary procedures.

Appendix E

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION FUNDS - FY 1983

	FORMULA DISTRIBUTION		DISCRETIONARY DISTRIBUTION		State
	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Administration
ALAB.	$9,244,763	$ 818,131	$ 115,000	$ 225,000	$1,664,020
ALAS.					
ARIZ.	3,527,320	1,175,549	1,756,580	655,851	1,092,300
ARK.	3,115,055	2,327,066	537,166	221,527	778,953
CALIF.	26,362,523	23,529,402	5,457,198	2,792,205	4,035,520
COLO.					
CONN.	2,205,000	554,000	2,421,100	531,400	1,810,000
DEL.	922,296	-0-	-0-	616,251	268,750
FLOR.					
GEOR.	6,817,848	8,968,500	-0-	-0-	2,341,753
IDA.	1,619,630	809,600	260,787	383,542	181,100
ILL.	11,003,082	8,132,685	2,756,372	4,046,802	1,949,009
IND.	1,856,588	954,105	2,192,411	3,007,589	799,281
IOWA	2,036,654	3,516,386	253,012	2,733,210	1,030,125
KANS.#					430,000
KENT.	5,809,087	5,167,307	48,942	2,526,965	---
LOUIS.	8,947,305	3,678,508	1,004,456	1,192,201	1,443,776
MAINE					
MARY.	9,191,382	1,724,282	-0-	-0-	1,105,899
MASS.					
MICH.	1,570,733	2,000,000	16,973,423	5,254,354	2,017,488

#Breakdown not available

Appendix E

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION FUNDS - FY 1983

	Other	Total
ALAB.	$2,387,878	$14,454,792
ALAS.		
ARIZ.	696,840	8,904,440
ARK.	1,167,426	8,147,193
CALIF.		62,176,908
COLO.		
CONN.		7,521,500
DEL.	9,212	1,816,509
FLOR.		
GEOR.	1,541,926	19,670,027
IDAHO		3,254,659
ILL.	3,169,648	31,057,598
IND.	9,250,652	18,060,626
IOWA	305,707	9,875,094
KANS.	-0-	6,876,780
KENT.	50,000	13,603,301
LOUIS.	487,489	16,753,735*
MAINE		
MARY.		12,021,569
MASS.		

*Totals were inconsistent among data sources due to incomplete data, carryovers, etc.

Appendix E (Continued)

	FORMULA DISTRIBUTION		DISCRETIONARY DISTRIBUTION		State
	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Administration
MINN.					
MISS.					
MISSO.	$3,259,968	$2,750,000			$ 670,000
MONT.			$1,188,234	$1,178,657	325,496
NEB.	2,869,177	1,099,422	---	556,546	489,297
NEV.	1,213,643	238,913	---	419,417	249,797
N.H.					
N.J.	7,013,309	3,329,210	-0-	2,631,848	3,442,160
N.M.	-0-	2,415,274	-0-	1,849,010	543,610
N.Y.	27,872,996	7,921,947	5,033,271	1,522,501	5,457,197
N.C.	14,868,804	6,945,673	-0-	-0-	1,119,789
N.D.	973,142	981,138	-0-	-0-	
OHIO	15,844,770	9,099,024	5,051,699	16,500	3,121,721
OKLA.	2,415,775	1,100,305	1,397,430	1,133,811	1,170,000
OREG.	1,965,492	1,964,492	1,352,552	1,352,552	1,134,747
PENN.	15,034,290	-0-	5,067,543	17,964,430	4,244,821
R.I.					
S.C.	8,302,302	1,034,949	248,217	269,784	1,856,267
S.D.	689,725	1,215,111	240,226	97,061	278,989
TENN.	3,561,000	4,144,000	-0-	-0-	803,000

*Totals were inconsistent among data sources due to incomplete data, carryovers, etc.

Appendix E (Continued)

	Other	Total
MICH.	-0-	27,779,998
MINN.		
MISS.		
MISSO.	$ 7,423,479	$14,103,447*
MONT.		2,692,387
NEB.	25,606	5,049,048
NEV.	249,797	2,121,770
N.H.		
N.J.	2,214,231	18,630,758*
N.M.		4,807,894
N.Y.	243,695	48,051,607
N.C.	-0-	22,943,266
N.D.		2,446,127
OHIO		33,133,714
OKA.	2,292,101	9,509,422
OREG.	905,487	8,674,322
PENN.	-0-	42,311,084
R.I.		
S.C.	467,073	12,178,592
S.D.		2,521,112
TENN.	8,210,000	16,718,000

*Totals were inconsistent among data sources due to incomplete data, carryovers, etc.

Appendix E (Continued)

	FORMULA DISTRIBUTION		DISCRETIONARY DISTRIBUTION		State
	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Administration
TEXAS	25,191,800	11,855,007	3,550,000	-0-	3,529,325
UTAH	977,830	1,012,830	1,732,272*	2,182,356*	713,437
VER.		$ 193,000			$ 301,615
VIR.	$12,871,961	1,397,250	$1,525,530	$ 436,267	869,615
WASH.					
W.VIR.					
WISC.		3,423,370		1,870,570	1,912,192
WYO.					

*Totals were inconsistent among data sources due to incomplete data, carryovers, etc.

Appendix E (Continued)

	Other	Total
TEXAS		44,126,222
UTAH		5,435,162*
VER.		$ 1,721,859*
VIR.	-0-	17,100,623
WASH.		
W.VIR.		
WISC.	$322,192	7,537,543* ($15,204,625)
WYO.		

*Totals were inconsistent among data sources due to incomplete data, carryovers, etc.

SOURCE: Survey of Vocational Education Funding Alternatives, Arizona Center for Vocational Education, September, 1983.

Appendix F

DISTRIBUTION OF BASIC STATE AID FORMULA FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - FY 1983

	Secondary Method	Post-Secondary Method	Secondary Amount	Post-Secondary Amount	Total
ALAB.	N	N	N	N	N
ALASKA					
ARIZ.	Block Grant-weighted	Weighted grants	--	--	--
ARK.	Proposed legislation weighted	N	N	N	N
CALIF.	N	N	--	--	--
COLO.	--	--	--	--	--
CONN.	N	N	N	N	N
DEL.	Pupil instruction units	?	$27,081,000	$21,647,000	$48,548,000
FLOR.	--	--	--	--	--
GEORG.	N	N	N	N	N
HAWAII	--	--	--	--	--
IDAHO	Added cost units	100% State funded	(Suppl.)	(Suppl.)	--
ILL.	N	N	N	N	N
IND.	Weighted formula	N	21,000,000	-0-	21,000,000
IOWA	N	N	N	N	N
KANS.	Weighted formula	Weighted formula	10,782,352	12,905,913	23,688,265
KENT.	Minimum foundation per ADA and teacher certification rank	-0-	50,000,000*	-0-	50,000,000*

N = None
NA = Not Available

Appendix F (Continued)

	Secondary Method	Post-Secondary Method	Secondary Amount	Post-Secondary Amount	Total
LOUIS.	Not specified	Not specified	12,648,821	4,870,709	17,519,530
MAINE	--	--	--	--	--
MARY.	Categorical grants from legislature	-0-	$2,900,000	-0-	$2,900,000
MASS.	--	--	--	--	--
MICH.	N	Weighted formula & average cost	N	NA	NA
MINN.	--	--	--	--	--
MISS.	--	--	--	--	--
MISSO.	N	N	N	N	N
MONT.	Not identified	Not identified	11,184,746	9,592,146	20,776,882
NEB.	N	N	N	N	N
NEV.	N	N	N	N	N
N.H.	--	--	--	--	--
N.J.	Weighted formula Categorical aid but gives no amounts				
N.M.	Weighted formula but gives no amounts				
N.Y.	N	N	N	N	N
N.C.	N	N	N	N	N
N.D.	N	N	N	N	N
OHIO	Teacher units formula	N	203,808,000	--	203,808,000

N = None
NA = Not Available

Appendix F (Continued)

	Secondary Method	Post-Secondary Method	Secondary Amount	Post-Secondary Amount	Total
OKLA.	Incentive Assistance Grants	Same	Area schools serving both sec. and post-sec.		22,540,475
OREG.	N	N	N	N	N
PENN.	Weighted formula	$800/student in 1983-84	NA	NA	NA
R.I.	--	--	--	--	--
S.C.	Weighted formula	No information provided	$93,359,035	No information provided	$93,359,035
S.D.	N	N	N	N	N
TENN.	Weighted formula	No information provided	44,970,691	No information provided	44,970,691
TEXAS	Method information was not provided	Not provided	234,433,000	205,432,140	439,865,140
UTAH	Weighted pupil units	-0-	20,000,000	-0-	20,000,000
VER.	--	--	--	--	--
VIR.	N	N	N	N	N
W.VIR.	--	--	--	--	--
WASH.	--	--	--	--	--
WISC.	--	Line item allocations	--	67,220,000	67,220,000
WYO.	--	--	--	--	--

N = None
NA = Not Available

Appendix G

DISTRIBUTION OF STATE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS
FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - FY 1983

	Secondary Appropriation	Post-Secondary Appropriation	Distribution Method	Total
ALA.	$62,508,147	$37,755,071	St. Bd. approved units and salary allocation	$100,263,218
ALAS.	--	--	--	--
ARIZ.	--	--	Special projects	--
ARK.	12,812,411	20,965,028	50% salary - Fed. formula PS - Fed. formula	33,777,439
CALIF.	--	--	--	--
COLO.	--	--	--	--
CONN.	3,090,000	-0-	2.09 M Vo-ag Grants reimb. 1 M equip. grant app. application ranked	3,090,000
DEL.	--	--	--	--
FLOR.	--	--	--	--
GEO.	76,174,740	50,604,944	Approved state - budgeted programs are funded	126,779,684
HAWAII	--	--	--	--
IDAHO	1,545,373	10,877,027	Same as Fed.	12,422,400
ILL.	21,809,655	11,265,345	Same as Fed. St. Plan	33,075,000

NA = Not Available

Appendix G (Continued)

	Secondary Appropriation	Post-Secondary Appropriation	Distribution Method	Total
IND.	1,250,000	(1 M combined)	Adult by formula 1 M by equip. grants	1,250,000
IOWA	3,622,000	8,700,000	?	12,322,000
KAN.	3,131,429	23,308,113	Formula	26,439,542
KEN.	-0-	40,000,000	General fund Approp. St. System	40,000,000
LA.	2,697,060	55,831,181	S-formula PS-Allocated by Leg.	58,825,241
MAINE	--	--	--	--
MARY.	NA	NA	NA	NA
MASS.	--	--	--	--
MICH.	21,300,000	3,000,000	Formula	24,300,000
MINN.	--	--	--	--
MISS.	--	--	--	--
MO.	24,926,138	?	Same as Fed.	24,926,138
MONT.	750,000	5,179,351	Formula	5,929,351
NEB.	123,728	168,142	Uniform Reimb. rate on Equip. and Adult	291,870
NEV.		-0-	$5,500 per Dist. $10,000 for Clubs	303,297
N.H.	--	--	--	--
N.J.	5,129,000	2,000,000	?	7,129,000

NA = Not Available

Appendix G (Continued)

	Secondary Appropriation	Post-Secondary Appropriation	Distribution Method	Total
N.M.	NA	NA	NA	NA
N.Y.	20,817,000	-0-	Restricted lg. cities Basic and ratio ceiling, certain voc ed enrollments	20,817,000
N.C.	82,386,015	131,981,034	Weighted formulas and average daily membership	214,367,049
N.D.	4,437,505	1,616,807	Reimb. rates	6,054,312
OHIO	15,880,336	10,632,310	Same as Fed. Formula	26,512,646
OKLA.	7,926,912	-0-	Incentive Grants	7,926,912
OREG.	NA	NA	NA	NA
PENN.	24,000,000	50,000,000	Formula (enrollment)	74,000,000
R.I.	--	--	--	--
S.C.	1,938,061	No information provided	Program grants	1,938,061
S.D.	1,877,972	3,370,853	Same as Fed. funds	5,286,679
TENN.	NA	NA	NA	NA
TEXAS	2,200,000	-0-	Formula	2,200,000
UTAH	17,512,331	Not provided	Weighted pupil units-same as basic aid	17,512,331
VER.	37,221,000	NA	Add-on/categorical by formula	37,221,000

NA = Not Available

Appendix G (Continued)

	Secondary Appropriation	Post-Secondary Appropriation	Distribution Method	Total
VIR.	--	--	--	--
WASH.	--	--	--	--
W.VIR.	--	--	--	--
WISC.	NA	NA	NA	NA
WYO.	--	--	--	--

NA = Not Available